

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the present amendments and following remarks. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 16 and 20 are amended, claim 3 is canceled and claims 35 and 36 are added. At this time, claims 1, 2 and 4-36 are pending in this case, with claims 1, 16 and 28 being independent claims. Claims 28-34 have been indicated as being allowed. The fee of \$50.00 for the net addition of one total claim is included along with the necessary fees for the filing of the RCE and for a two-month extension of time. It is believed that no additional fees are due for the consideration of this paper. However, if fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account number 13-2855.

**Claims Amendments**

Claims 1 and 16 are amended to more clearly recite that the packaging system recited therein includes both a container having a rim and a blister package including first and second blister sections connected to form the blister package and to define a lower portion configured to engage the rim of the container. The claims are further amended to recite that the connected sections form at least one blister portion for receiving a displayed item. Claim 3 is canceled as being redundant in view of the limitations of claim 1 as amended, and claims 4, 7 and 20 are amended for consistency with the amendments to claims 1 and 16. The amendments to claims 1 and 16 are supported by the specification as originally filed at least at Figs. 1-3 and the accompanying text wherein the blister package 24 is formed by first blister section 40 and second blister section 46 which define blister portions 52, 54 receiving items 56, 58, respectively, and first portion 20 defined by blister sections 40, 46 and configured to engage the rim 14 of container 12. Claims 35 and 36 added hereby recite that the containers recited in independent claims 1 and 16, respectively, are disposed external to the blister package when the lower portion engages the rim of the container. The new claims are supported by the specification as originally filed at least at Figs. 1 and 2 and the accompanying text wherein the container 12 is disposed external to the blister package 24 when the first portion 20 engages the rim 14 of the container 12. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 16 and the addition of claims 35 and 36 do not present new matter and do not raise new issues, and respectfully request entry of the present

amendments to claims 1, 4, 7, 16 and 20 and of new claims 35 and 36, and consideration of the claims as amended.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-17, 20-22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Miyake (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,471), claims 1-4, 7, 9, 13-17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Glassman (U.S. Patent No. 6,227,369), and claims 8 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glassman in view of Miyake. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and request reconsideration in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 16 and the following remarks.

Starting with the claim rejections in view of Miyake, applicant respectfully submits that Miyake only discloses blister packaging formed by first and second blister sections, namely body 12 and protective cover 14, and does not disclose the blister package in combination with another container and defining a portion configured to engage a rim of another container as recited in claims 1 and 16. The claims as amended more clearly recite two distinct elements: a container, and a blister package that engages the container. Miyake only discloses a blister package, and does not suggest the blister package being configured to engage a separate container. Since Miyake only teaches a blister package and not a blister package in combination with a container as recited in claims 1 and 16, Miyake does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, Miyake does not suggest or provide motivation for modifying the blister pack 10 to include a portion for capturing a rim of a separate container, or for attaching the blister pack 10 to a separate container. Consequently, claims 1 and 16, and the claims depending therefrom, are also not rendered obvious by Miyake.

Regarding the rejections in view of Glassman, as with Miyake, Glassman merely teaches a blister pack 10 formed by mating clamshell members 12, 14, and does not teach the blister pack 10 being configured to engage a separate container. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed above for Miyake, Glassman does not teach a blister package in combination with and engaging a container as recited in the claims. Therefore, claims 1 and 16 and the claims depending therefrom are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Glassman for the reasons discussed above. Further, the combination of Glassman and

Miyake proposed in the rejection of claims 8 and 21 also fails to render the claims obvious for the same reasons.

Regarding new claims 35 and 36, the applied references do not disclose or suggest any item engaged by a blister package being disposed external to the blister package, let alone a container engaged by a portion of a blister package as recited in the new claims, and only. In Miyake, a camera 16 and an accessory 18 are disposed within the blister pack 10 as shown in Fig. 1 and discussed throughout the specification. (*See, e.g.*, Miyake, col. 5, lines 22-39; col. 5, line 60 through col. 6, line 5; col. 7, lines 29-64). Similarly, Glassman discloses clamshell packages 10, 50 having three dimensionally shaped pocket areas 12a, 14a and 52a, 54a, respectively, for receiving products within the packages 10, 50. (*See* Glassman, Figs. 1 and 5 and accompanying text at col. 3, lines 15-19 and col. 4, lines 8-9, respectively). Further, the references do not teach or suggest alternative configurations of the packages wherein any portion of the items are disposed external to the blister package. Consequently, claims 35 and 36 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Miyake and Glassman for this additional reason.

For at least the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the currently pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, she is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: Scott E. Baxendale  
Scott E. Baxendale  
Registration No.: 41,605  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Attorney for Applicant